

# IA Part C

## FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Executive Summary:

## Iowa's IDEA Part C FFY 2015 Annual Performance Report

## Executive Summary

The table below summarizes targets, actual data, status for meeting targets and slippage for indicators 1 through 11 as reported in the FFY 2015 APR.

Indicator	Target %	Data %	Status	Slippage
1	100	99.56	Did not meet target	No slippage
2	96.60	98.69	Met target	No slippage
3A1	45.13	49.74	Met target	No slippage
3A2	70.40	69.81	Did not meet target	No slippage
3B1	50.83	53.03	Met target	No slippage
3B2	50.59	54.19	Met target	No slippage
3C1	56.58	59.42	Met target	No slippage
3C2	71.74	71.78	Met target	No slippage
4A	93.00	83.80	Did not meet target	No slippage
4B	93.00	87.21	Did not meet target	No slippage
4C	93.00	86.35	Did not meet target	No slippage
5	1.35	1.56	Met target	No slippage
6	2.60	2.91	Met target	No slippage
7	100	99.72	Did not meet target	No slippage
8A	100	99.16	Did not meet target	No slippage
8B	100	100	Met target	No slippage
8C	100	98.70	Did not meet target	No slippage
9	NA	NA	NA	NA
10	NA	NA	NA	NA
11	89	86.35		

All findings of noncompliance reported in the FFY 2014 APR were corrected and verified within the 365 day timeline.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

### General Supervision System:


The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

See attached PDF which includes all sections of the introduction.

## Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
-----------	-------------	---------------	--------

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date	Remove
<a href="#">introduction iowa apr.pdf</a>	Cindy Weigel		 Remove

### Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

### Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

**Stakeholder Involvement:**  apply this to all Part C results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

### Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each EIS Program or Provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

See PDF attached to General Supervision System section which includes all sections of the introduction.

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

### OSEP Response

**Required Actions**

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 1: Timely provision of services

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments



Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		100%	100%	100%	100%	99.25%	97.51%	99.45%	99.44%	98.86%	97.19%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
606	677	97.19%	100%	99.56%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

68

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

The data was selected from the full reporting period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data for this indicator were taken from the statewide Iowa Information Management System (IMS) database for the current full reporting period and reflect all new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees.

A random sample of children from all regional grantees was created ensuring a confidence level of 95% +/- 3.4% margin of error.

The lead agency conducted the reviews using an Excel data collection form. Data are based on the actual number of days, not the average, between parental consent and the date specified on the IFSP service log notes for delivery of first service. Services are considered timely if initiated within 30 calendar days from the date in which consent for services was obtained (State criteria). Iowa has reported separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances in the appropriate field above.

The State had an increase of 2.37% from the previous year (97.19% FFY 2014, 99.56% FFY 2015) producing a gap of only 0.44% between the current years data and the 100% target, achieving substantial compliance for timely services. Three children's services were untimely due to system reasons defined as staff illness or scheduling.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
110	110	0	0

#### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Nine regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2014 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. The nine regional grantees were required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency. All nine regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction. The lead agency monitoring consultant was responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR. In each region that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, a follow-up review of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities was conducted. The regional grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for timely services.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The lead agency verified that the nine regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2014 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that services were provided even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The children that did not receive services within 30 days did in fact receive the early intervention services at a later date. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

#### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

#### Required Actions

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			96.20%	96.30%	96.40%	96.50%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%
Data		96.40%	97.61%	98.40%	98.52%	99.05%	98.89%	98.64%	98.57%	98.51%	98.92%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%	96.60%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Several key stakeholder groups were integral in providing input on setting targets. The group, members, and meeting dates specific to the setting targets are provided in the below table.

#### Group, Members and Meeting Dates of Key Stakeholders for Setting Targets

Group	Members	Meeting Dates
State Interagency Coordinating Council (Iowa Council for Early ACCESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>Service Providers</li> <li>Signatory Agencies at the State and Regional Level</li> <li>Representative of Insurance Commission</li> <li>Mental Health Providers</li> <li>Representative of Head Start</li> <li>Local/Regional/State Representatives of Mental Health, Private Medical and Physicians</li> <li>Higher Education</li> </ul>	September 19, 2014
Regional Grantee Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directors of Special Education for nine Regional Grantees</li> </ul>	January 22, 2015
Early ACCESS Leadership Group	Representatives of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Grantees</li> <li>Signatory Agencies</li> </ul>	August 26-27, 2014  January 21-22, 2015

The Lead Agency, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets. The FFY 2013 target will remain at 96.60% and continue as the target through FFY 2018.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</a>	3,403	
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</a>	3,448	

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3,403	3,448	98.92%	96.60%	98.69%

**Actions required in FFY 2014 response**

none

**OSEP Response****Required Actions**



# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? No

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2008	Target ≥						40.13%	41.63%	43.13%	44.63%	44.63%	44.63%
		Data					40.13%	40.33%	40.14%	43.36%	43.33%	46.53%	45.22%
A2	2008	Target ≥						65.40%	66.90%	68.40%	69.90%	69.90%	69.90%
		Data					65.40%	66.35%	68.94%	68.38%	68.03%	71.40%	68.00%
B1	2008	Target ≥						45.83%	47.33%	48.83%	50.33%	50.33%	50.33%
		Data					45.83%	40.20%	47.20%	47.83%	47.34%	50.26%	49.70%
B2	2008	Target ≥						45.59%	47.09%	48.59%	50.09%	50.09%	50.09%
		Data					45.59%	46.05%	51.07%	51.04%	51.99%	54.38%	52.06%
C1	2008	Target ≥						51.58%	53.08%	54.58%	56.08%	56.08%	56.08%
		Data					51.58%	48.82%	52.72%	54.13%	55.53%	58.99%	56.56%
C2	2008	Target ≥						66.74%	68.24%	69.74%	71.24%	71.24%	71.24%
		Data					66.74%	64.93%	71.38%	70.97%	69.86%	72.77%	69.83%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	45.13%	45.63%	46.13%	46.63%
Target A2 ≥	70.40%	70.90%	71.40%	71.90%
Target B1 ≥	50.83%	51.33%	51.83%	52.33%
Target B2 ≥	50.59%	51.09%	51.59%	52.09%
Target C1 ≥	56.58%	57.08%	57.58%	58.08%
Target C2 ≥	71.74%	72.24%	72.74%	73.24%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Several key stakeholder groups were integral in providing input on setting targets. The group, members, and meeting dates specific to the setting targets are provided in the below table.

#### Group, Members and Meeting Dates of Key Stakeholders for Setting Targets

Group	Members	Meeting Dates
State Interagency Coordinating Council (Iowa Council for Early ACCESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>Service Providers</li> <li>Signatory Agencies at the State and Regional Level</li> <li>Representative of Insurance Commission</li> <li>Mental Health Providers</li> <li>Representative of Head Start</li> <li>Local/Regional/State Representatives of Mental Health, Private Medical and Physicians</li> <li>Higher Education</li> </ul>	September 19, 2014
Regional Grantee Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directors of Special Education for nine Regional Grantees</li> </ul>	January 22, 2015

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Early ACCESS Leadership Group	Representatives of the:	August 22, 2015
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Grantees</li> <li>Signatory Agencies</li> </ul>	January 21-22, 2015

The lead agency, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets. The FFY 2013 and FFY 2014 targets will remain the same as FFY 2012. For FFY 2015 through FFY 2018, targets for all outcome summary statements will increase by 0.5% each year.

## FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	2388.00
--	---------

## Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	15.00	0.63%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	564.00	23.62%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	142.00	5.95%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	431.00	18.05%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1236.00	51.76%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	573.00	1152.00	45.22%	45.13%	49.74%
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1667.00	2388.00	68.00%	70.40%	69.81%

## Outcome B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	16.00	0.67%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	790.00	33.08%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	288.00	12.06%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	622.00	26.05%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	672.00	28.14%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	910.00	1716.00	49.70%	50.83%	53.03%
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1294.00	2388.00	52.06%	50.59%	54.19%

## Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	14.00	0.59%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	503.00	21.06%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	157.00	6.57%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	600.00	25.13%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1114.00	46.65%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014	FFY 2015	FFY 2015
12/5/2017					

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

			Data*	Target*	Data
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (c+d)/(a+b+c+d).	757.00	1274.00	56.56%	56.58%	59.42%
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e).	1714.00	2388.00	69.83%	71.74%	71.78%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? Yes

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			90.00%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		89.90%	96.40%	96.36%	96.25%	97.29%	97.91%	98.19%	90.00%	84.02%	79.84%
B	2005	Target ≥			89.50%	89.50%	90.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		89.20%	95.90%	95.05%	95.97%	97.29%	97.62%	98.19%	93.49%	87.57%	85.86%
C	2005	Target ≥			91.00%	91.00%	92.00%	93.00%	94.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
		Data		90.50%	95.80%	94.61%	95.82%	96.72%	96.72%	97.29%	91.11%	84.91%	83.25%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Target B ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%
Target C ≥	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%	93.00%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Several key stakeholder groups were integral in providing input on setting targets. The group, members, and meeting dates specific to the setting targets are provided in the below table.

#### Group, Members and Meeting Dates of Key Stakeholders for Setting Targets

Group	Members	Meeting Dates
State Interagency Coordinating Council (Iowa Council for Early ACCESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>Service Providers</li> <li>Signatory Agencies at the State and Regional Level</li> <li>Representative of Insurance Commission</li> <li>Mental Health Providers</li> <li>Representative of Head Start</li> <li>Local/Regional/State Representatives of Mental Health, Private Medical and Physicians</li> <li>Higher Education</li> </ul>	September 19, 2014
Regional Grantee Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directors of Special Education for nine Regional Grantees</li> </ul>	January 22, 2015
Early ACCESS Leadership Group	Representatives of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Grantees</li> <li>Signatory Agencies</li> </ul>	August 26-27, 2014  January 21-22, 2015

The lead agency, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets. The FFY 2013 target will remain at 93.00% and continue as the target through FFY 2018.

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent families participating in Part C	469.00
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	393.00
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	469.00
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	409.00
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	469.00
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	405.00
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	469.00

	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	79.84%	93.00%	83.80%
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	85.86%	93.00%	87.21%
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	83.25%	93.00%	86.35%

## Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

Names of all children who have annual IFSP review are pulled quarterly therefore ensuring they have been in early intervention at least 12 months. Families completing their surveys during the current reporting period are included in the data. The State experienced a return rate of 28%, yielding a 95% confidence level with a +/- 3.4% margin of error.

The following table shows that the survey population is representative of the Part C population for race/ethnicity as all categories show less than a 1.61% difference (Column E).

Respondent population rates by race/ethnicity were also analyzed and compared to the survey population (Column F) and compared to the Part C population (Column G). Efforts to get increased response rates from all participants include sending multiple emails/paper surveys to families who have not responded to previous requests. In addition, at annual IFSP meetings the service coordinators remind families a survey is coming and emphasizes the importance of completing the survey. Further efforts to support return rates for race categories other than white may include increased personal contacts and reducing time between annual meeting and receiving the invitation to complete a survey.

Percent of Race/Ethnicity Survey Population Compared to Part C Population

	N = 3,448	N = 1,671	N = 474	Column E	Column F	Column G
Race	Part C Population	Survey Population	Respondent Population	Difference between Part C Population and Survey Population	Difference between Survey Population and Respondent Population	Difference between Part C Population and Respondent Population
Hispanic	11.19%	9.58%	6.75%	-1.61%	-2.83%	-4.44%
American Indian	0.73%	0.54%	0.42%	-0.19%	-0.12%	-0.31%
Asian	2.29%	2.09%	2.11%	-0.20%	0.02%	-0.18%
Black/African American	5.28%	4.37%	2.53%	-0.91%	-1.84%	-2.75%
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0.15%	0.12%	0.21%	-0.03%	0.09%	0.06%
White	74.65%	76.12%	82.07%	1.47%	5.95%	7.42%
Two or more Races chosen	5.71%	7.18%	5.91%	1.47%	-1.27%	0.20%
Total	100%	100%	100%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Source. Iowa Information Management System (IMS), FFY 2015.

The following table shows that the survey population is representative of the Part C population for sex as both categories show only a 1.54% difference (Column E). Respondent population rates by sex were also analyzed and compared to the survey population (Column F) and compared to the Part C population (Column G) and indicate that both populations are representative of the Part C population.

Percent of Race/Ethnicity Survey Population Compared to Part C Population

	N = 3,448	N = 1,671	N = 474	Column E	Column F	Column G
Sex	Part C Population	Survey Population	Respondent Population	Difference between Part C Population and Survey Population	Difference between Survey Population and Respondent Population	Difference between Part C Population and Respondent Population
Female	40.23%	41.77%	39.87%	1.54%	-1.90%	-0.36%
Male	59.77%	58.23%	60.13%	-1.54%	1.90%	0.36%
Total	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%

Source. Iowa Information Management System (IMS), FFY 2015.

Was sampling used?    Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?    No

Was a collection tool used?    Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool?    No

☒ Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

☐ No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Quarterly samples were pulled throughout the year for children who had annual reviews and where families completed their surveys during the current reporting period. Families with recorded email addresses were emailed a survey through the I-STAR data system. The generated emails contain a unique child pass code for families to enter when completing the survey online. Families who did not have a current email address were mailed surveys with a return envelope. If families needed an interpreter for any reason, the lead agency worked with regional grantees to have a paper survey completed. All paper surveys were anonymously mailed to the lead agency and recorded in the I-STAR system by the monitoring consultant or support staff. A unique pass code was also included on all paper surveys so that survey data remained anonymous upon entry into the system. Approximately 1667 surveys were either mailed or emailed to families, with a total of 469 surveys completed (return rate of 28%). Additionally, the 469 surveys returned out of the 3,448 infants and toddlers receiving Early ACCESS services on the October count day yields a 95% confidence level with a +/- 3.4% margin of error.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

### OSEP Response

The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was representative of the population. However, in the narrative, the State reported, "The greatest difference in response rates for race/ethnicity categories is seen for whites (7.42% greater representation)." In addition the State reported in the data table labeled: *"Percent Race/Ethnicity Survey Population Compared to Part C Population,"* that Hispanic/Latino survey respondents were under-represented by -4.44%.

Therefore, OSEP is unclear whether or not the response group was representative of the population. OSEP notes that the State did not include strategies or improvement activities to address this issue in the future.

### Required Actions

In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2016 response data represent the demographics of the State, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue.

# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			1.10%	1.10%	1.10%	1.20%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.30%	1.35%
Data		1.22%	1.42%	1.54%	1.59%	1.74%	1.63%	1.56%	1.71%	1.68%	1.61%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	1.35%	1.40%	1.40%	1.45%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Several key stakeholder groups were integral in providing input on setting targets. The group, members, and meeting dates specific to the setting targets are provided in the following table.

#### Group, Members and Meeting Dates of Key Stakeholders for Setting Targets

Group	Members	Meeting Dates
State Interagency Coordinating Council (Iowa Council for Early ACCESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>Service Providers</li> <li>Signatory Agencies at the State and Regional Level</li> <li>Representative of Insurance Commission</li> <li>Mental Health Providers</li> <li>Representative of Head Start</li> <li>Local/Regional/State Representatives of Mental Health, Private Medical and Physicians</li> <li>Higher Education</li> </ul>	September 19, 2014
Regional Grantee Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directors of Special Education for nine Regional Grantees</li> </ul>	January 2, 2015
Early ACCESS Leadership Group	Representatives of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Grantees</li> <li>Signatory Agencies</li> </ul>	August 26-27, 2014  January 21-22, 2015

The Lead Agency, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets ranging from 1.30 to 1.45% for FFY 2013-FFY 2018.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</a>	615	null
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</a>	39,518	null

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
615	39,518	1.61%	1.35%	1.56%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions



# FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

### Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			2.10%	2.10%	2.10%	2.30%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%
Data		2.33%	2.52%	2.69%	2.89%	3.05%	3.01%	3.08%	3.03%	3.03%	2.94%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	2.60%	2.60%	2.70%	2.70%

Key:

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Several key stakeholder groups were integral in providing input on setting targets. The group, members, and meeting dates specific to the setting targets are provided in the following table.

#### Group, Members and Meeting Dates of Key Stakeholders for Setting Targets

Group	Members	Meeting Dates
State Interagency Coordinating Council (Iowa Council for Early ACCESS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parents of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>Service Providers</li> <li>Signatory Agencies at the State and Regional Level</li> <li>Representative of Insurance Commission</li> <li>Mental Health Providers</li> <li>Representative of Head Start</li> <li>Local/Regional/State Representatives of Mental Health, Private Medical and Physicians</li> <li>Higher Education</li> </ul>	September 19, 2014
Regional Grantee Administrators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directors of Special Education for nine Regional Grantees</li> </ul>	January 22, 2015
Early ACCESS Leadership Group	Representatives of the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional Grantees</li> <li>Signatory Agencies</li> </ul>	August 26-27, 2014  January 21-22, 2015

The Lead Agency, with input from stakeholder groups, established measurable and rigorous targets ranging from 2.50% to 2.70% for FFY 2013-FFY 2018.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	7/14/2016	<a href="#">Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</a>	3,448	
U.S. Census Annual State Resident Population Estimates April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2015	6/30/2016	<a href="#">Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</a>	118,486	

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3,448	118,486	2.94%	2.60%	2.91%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data											
Baseline Data: 2005											
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	90.90%	97.66%	98.73%	99.36%	99.85%	99.76%	99.84%	99.68%	99.29%
Key: <div></div> Gray – Data Prior to Baseline <div></div> Yellow – Baseline											
FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets											
FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018							
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%							

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data					
Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data	
2,820	3,263	99.29%	100%	99.72%	
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>					434

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☒ State database

Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).

Data were selected from the full reporting period.

Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Data for this indicator were taken from the statewide Iowa Information Management System (IMS) database for the current full reporting period and reflect all infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP was required to be conducted. No sampling was used. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. The lead agency conducted the reviews using an Excel data collection form for every regional grantee. Data are based on the actual number of days, not the average, between date of referral and the date of the initial IFSP meeting.

Iowa has reported separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances in the appropriate field above.

The State remained virtually unchanged from last reporting period (99.29% FFY 14 and 99.72% FFY 15) producing a gap of only 0.28% between the current year's data and the 100% target, achieving substantial compliance for timely evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings. The nine children with untimely evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings were due to system reasons defined as: staff shortages, vacation, illness, or scheduling.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	24	0	0

### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

*Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements*

Five regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2014 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. The five regional grantees were required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed, followed by verification by the lead agency.

In each region that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, a follow-up review of data from IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities was conducted. The regional grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for timely services. The regional grantees made corrections within 365 days (including the State's verification of correction) and met the requirement for timely correction.

*Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected*

The lead agency verified that the five regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2014 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings were held even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The infants and toddlers that did not receive evaluations and initial IFSP meetings within 45 days did, in fact, have the evaluations completed and meetings held at a later date. All regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

### Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	94.00%	97.96%	99.68%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.76%	99.47%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data



Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

-  Yes
-  No

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
825	832	99.47%	100%	99.16%

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	0
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All regional grantees were selected for monitoring. Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, or children exiting Part C for other services as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of children exiting Part C was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error for each regional grantee. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews and then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification of noncompliance to regional grantees.

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	null	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Three regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2014 and were notified of findings of noncompliance. Each regional grantee was required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no late than one year form the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency.

For the three regional grantees that had findings of noncompliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, follow-up reviews of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities were conducted. The regional grantees demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for developing an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the three regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2014 using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual child noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The Lead Agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that transition activities occurred even though the timeline was not met, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The three regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		96.00%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
460	460	100%	100%	100%

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of children exiting Part C was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error for each regional grantee. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews and then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification of noncompliance to regional grantees.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? No

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All 9 regional grantees in the state were selected for monitoring.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	null	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions



FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:



- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		87.00%	91.00%	95.25%	99.40%	99.37%	99.35%	98.73%	100%	98.71%	99.30%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data



Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services

-  Yes
-  No

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
432	460	99.30%	100%	98.70%

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference <i>This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.</i>	0
Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances <i>This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties at least nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.</i>	22

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All regional grantees were selected for monitoring.

Data were obtained from files of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B as part of the Part C statewide file review process using Iowa's System to Achieve Results (I-STAR) monitoring system. The monitoring cycle occurs annually with all regional grantees. A random sample of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B was created using a confidence level of 95% with a +/- 10% margin of error for each regional grantee. State staff conducted IFSP file reviews and then desk audits were completed by the lead agency monitoring consultant. The data were then entered into the I-STAR data monitoring system which sends written notification

12/5/2017

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) of noncompliance to regional grantees.

Iowa did include in the calculation the number of children for whom the State identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances. The State did include in the calculation the number of children for whom the family did not provide approval to conduct the transition conference which resulted in delays in timely transition.

### Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	null	0

### FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Two regional grantees did not meet the 100% target in FFY 2014 and were notified of noncompliance. The regional grantees were required to analyze root causes and correct each case of noncompliance, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the provider, as soon as possible and no later than one year from the date of notification of noncompliance. The corrective actions were completed followed by verification by the lead agency.

For the two regional grantees that had findings of non-compliance, after technical assistance and corrective activities occurred, follow-up reviews of data from five IFSPs with dates subsequent to the corrective activities were conducted. Each regional grantee demonstrated implementation of the requirement with 100% compliance for holding a timely transition conference at least 90 days and not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday. The regional grantees made corrections within the 365 day time line (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The lead agency verified that the two regional grantees corrected noncompliance for FFY 2014 using Iowa's System to Achieve results (I-STAR). I-STAR has been used for monitoring correction of all individual noncompliance including verification of correction (Prong 2) within the 365 day timeline. The lead agency monitoring consultant is responsible for verifying timely correction via I-STAR.

Corrective actions included assuring that transition activities occurred even though the timeline was not met unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program. The two regions made corrections within the 365 day timeline (including the State's verification of correction) and met requirements for timely correction.

### OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

### Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data

Baseline Data:

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Not applicable as Iowa has adopted the Part C due process procedures under 34 CFR §303.420.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	<a href="#">3.1 Number of resolution sessions</a>	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none




OSEP Response

This indicator is not applicable to the State.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 10: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision  
Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.  
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Historical Data											
Baseline Data: 2005											
FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥											
Data											
Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update											

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥				
Key:				

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The state of Iowa has had less than 10 mediations a year. Therefore, the state is not required to set targets for indicator C10.

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</a>	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	<a href="#">2.1 Mediations held</a>	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	0			

Actions required in FFY 2014 response
none

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2015. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

### Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)  
Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target		87.00%	89.00%
Data	85.00%	83.25%	86.35%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	91.00%	93.00%	93.00%

Key:

Description of Measure

See SSIP Phase 1 and 2.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See SSIP Phase 1 and 2.

Overview

See SSIP Phase 1 and 2.

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., EIS program and/or EIS provider, geographic region, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, etc.) As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in EIS programs and/or EIS providers to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and other early learning initiatives, such as Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge and the Home Visiting program and describe the extent that these new initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure

## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Analyses and must be a child- or family-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increase the rate of growth in infants and toddlers demonstrating positive social-emotional skills) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increase the percentage reported under child outcome B under Indicator 3 of the SPP/APR (knowledge and skills) and increase the percentage trend reported for families under Indicator 4 (helping their child develop and learn)).

### Statement

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

### Description

## Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support EIS program and/or EIS provider implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified result(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build EIS program and/or EIS provider capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

See attached PDF for all components of the Iowa Part C SSIP.

## Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in EIS programs and/or EIS providers, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

## Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted



Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

## Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

## Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

## Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.



## FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

### Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

See attached FFY 14 APR SSIP Phase II Iowa Part C report.

See attached Appendices A-E.

### Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

### A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

### B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

### C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

### D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

### E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

### F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See attached PDF *Iowa Part C SSIP Phase III Year 1 FFY 2015*.

**OSEP Response**

**Required Actions**

**FFY 2015 Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)**  
**Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

**Selected:** Designated by the Lead Agency Director to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Kimberly Villotti

Title: Administrative Consultant

Email: Kimberly.Villotti@iowa.gov

Phone: 515-281-4709